

## **REMARKS**

Review and reconsideration of the non-final Office Action mailed July 17, 2011 (the "Office Action"), is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any surplus to Deposit Account No. 04-1679.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 13-14 were pending. By this amendment, claims 15-19 have been added. No new matter is added.

The amendments presented herein have been made solely to expedite prosecution of the instant application to allowance and should not be construed as an indication of Applicants' agreement with or acquiescence to the Examiner's position. Accordingly, Applicants expressly maintain the right to pursue broader subject matter through subsequent amendments, continuation or divisional applications, reexamination or reissue proceedings, and all other available means. The amendments and rejections are addressed below in more detail.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner McClain-Coleman for granting Applicant's request for a telephonic interview. Applicant's undersigned representative looks forward to speaking with the Examiner on November 2, 2011 at 11:30 am.

### **Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Abraham, "A Solution to Spontaneous Combustion in Linseed Oil Formulations," Polymer Degradation and Stability (1996) ("Abraham") in view of Buist et. al., "In Situ Burning," Pure Appl. Chem. (1999) ("Buist"). Applicants respectfully submit that Abraham and Buist are completely unrelated; that no person of skill in the art would combine them; and even if Abraham and Buist were combined, they do not disclose or suggest the claimed method.

As set forth in claim 1, the claimed method is drawn to:

1. (Previously presented) A method for forming a gelatinous film having a peeling property relative to a base, comprising the steps of applying cooking oil onto a surface of a base; and bringing a surface of the cooking oil applied onto the surface of the base into contact with a flame having a temperature of 1,000 °C or above, wherein said gelatinous film is formed only from cooking oil and formed by the contact of the surface of said cooking oil with flame.

Thus, the claimed method relates to a method of forming a gelatinous film having a peeling property relative to a base. The method includes applying a cooking oil onto a surface of a base; and bringing a surface of the cooking oil applied onto the surface of the base into contact with a flame having a temperature of 1,000 °C or above. The gelatinous film is formed only from cooking oil and is formed by the contact of the surface of said cooking oil with flame.

Abraham is drawn to a method of preventing varnishes and oil-based house paints containing linseed oil from spontaneously combusting while they are drying. Abraham, Abstract. Spontaneous combustion of such varnishes and paints has substantial consequences, including the possibility that it will cause a home or other building to burn to the ground. Thus, the critical aspect of Abraham is to prevent the varnishes and oil-based house paints containing linseed oil from igniting, which they will do spontaneously. *Since the whole point of Abraham is to prevent fires caused by the varnishes and paints, a person of skill in the art would not contact the varnish or paint with a flame for any reason, much less expecting to form a stable gelatinous film having a peeling property relative to a base.*

Buist is drawn to a method of remediating oil spills in the open ocean. Buist, Page 43. As an initial matter, Buist is related to highly toxic crude oil, not cooking oils or linseed oil. *Id.* Furthermore, Buist relates to remediation (i.e., removal) of crude oil by intentionally setting it on fire. *In contrast, Buist is drawn to a technique that prevents spontaneous combustion.* Thus, Buist and Abraham are completely unrelated and contradictory. As a result, *a person of skill in the art would not combine Abraham and Buist in any way and certainly would not expect that some contrived combination of Abraham and Buist could produce a method of forming a stable gelatinous film having a peeling property relative to a base.* In view of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully request that all rejection based on combination of Abraham and Buist be withdrawn.

The foregoing arguments are even stronger with respect to new claims 15-19, which relate to contacting foodstuffs with the gelatinous film.


**Conclusion**

For at least the reasons set forth above, the independent claims are believed to be allowable. In addition, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependence on an allowable base claim and for further features recited therein. The application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. If any issues remain outstanding, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned (561-962-2110) if it is believed that a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**DUANE MORRIS LLP**

Date: October 21, 2011



J. Rodman Steele, Jr., Reg. No. 25,931  
Gregory M. Lezkowitz, Reg. No. 56,216  
2700 N. Military Trail, Suite 300  
Boca Raton, FL 33431  
Phone: (561) 962-2100  
Fax: (561) 962-2101

Docket No. 1625-202